

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

The attached drawing sheet includes a change to Figure 21. Element 49 has been changed to 494.

A description of the amendments has been included in the remark section of this Response. The Replacement figures are informal drawings. Formal figures will be submitted upon the Notice of Allowance.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

Attorney Docket: 1141.11A  
Serial No: 10/685,981

### REMARKS

This paper is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated September 14, 2005, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on December 14, 2005.

Claim 8, 23, 27 and 31 are currently amended.

Claims 1 - 32 are currently pending in the Application.

#### **I. Drawings objections**

The drawings were objected to for not showing a fluid supply line 45. The specification has been amended to refer to a fluid supply line 65. Reconsideration is requested.

The drawings were further objected to for showing an undescribed numeral 49 in Figure 21 (as originally filed). Figure 22 (of the substitute drawings filed on February 12, 2004) has been amended to refer to numeral 494. The Replacement figures are informal drawings. Formal figures will be submitted upon the Notice of Allowance. Reconsideration is requested.

#### **II. Claim Objections**

Claims 23 and 27 were objected to for use of acronyms. Claims 23 and 27 (also 8 and 31) have been amended to delete reference to the acronyms. Reconsideration is requested.

#### **III. Double Patenting Rejection**

Claims 1,3, 4, 7 and 10 stand rejected for double patenting, obviousness type. The rejection is overcome by the terminal disclaimer attached hereto. Reconsideration is requested.

Claim 12 also stands rejected for double patenting, obviousness type. This rejection is also overcome by the attached terminal disclaimer. Reconsideration is therefore also requested.

#### **IV. Rejections under 35 USC § 103**

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

Attorney Docket: 104141A  
Serial No: 10/685,981

10

Claims 27 and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williford et al., US 5,855,455, January 5, 1999 in view of Suksumake, US 5,492,436, February 20, 1996. This rejection is traversed but is submitted to be obviated by amendment.

As amended, claim 27 recites a "projecting cantilever". Suksumake shows a cantilever construction in the bridge sense, a beam extending between end supports, and the derrick is clearly incapable to being positioned anywhere but over the deck. The requirements of a "projecting cantilever" and a tower which is "movable by the projecting cantilever to a position which projects beyond the deck" clearly place the claimed invention in a different application than that addressed in Suksumake. There is nothing in Suksumake which is suggestive of utilizing a support cart between a projecting cantilever and tower as recited in claim 27 as amended and the support deck. There is further nothing in Suksumake which is suggestive of utilizing a "rotatable" cart. Claim 32 distinguishes the combined references on at least the same basis as claim 27. Reconsideration is therefore requested.

Claim 31 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williford et al in view of Suksumake further in view of Landry, US 6,269,880, August 7, 2001. Claim 31 distinguishes these references at least on the same basis as pointed out for claim 27 above. Landry adds nothing to the combined teachings of Williford and Suksumake as to the distinguishing features of claim 27 pointed out above. Reconsideration of this rejection is therefore also requested.

#### **V. Indication of allowable subject matter**

Claims 13-26 were indicated to be allowed. Claims 2, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11 and 28-30 were indicated to be allowable if amended to independent form, including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The rejection of the base claim 1 is obviated by terminal disclaimer, so claims 2, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, which all depend ultimately from claim 1, should now be in allowable form without amendment. Claim 28 has been amended so as to overcome the objection as to it. Claims 29-30 depend from claim 28, so the objection is overcome to them as well. Reconsideration of the objections to claims 2, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11 and 28-30 is therefore requested.

Applicants appreciates the Examiner's time and attention to this matter. Applicants believes no new matter has been added with any amendments that have been made. Applicants believes claims as now provided are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 12/8/05



Wendy K. Buskop  
Patent Attorney  
Reg. No. 32,202

Please mail correspondence to:

The address associated with customer number 29637.

Wendy K.B. Buskop  
Buskop Law Group, P.C.  
1776 Yorktown, Suite 550  
Houston, Texas 77056  
713.275.3400

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

Attorney Docket: 1141.11A  
Serial No: 10/685,981

12